

The Classical Weekly

VOL. XI.

MONDAY, APRIL 22, 1918

No. 24

APR 25 1918
UNIV. OF MICH.
LIBRARY

Columbia University Summer Session

July 8—August 16, 1918

GENERAL LINGUISTICS—

s102 Introduction to Linguistic Science Professor Sturtevant

GREEK—

s1 Elementary Course Professor Macurdy
s2 Xenophon Professor Macurdy
s3 Homer, Iliad Professor Sturtevant
s105 Informal Lectures on the History of Greek Philosophy
Professor Shorey
s153 Greek Life and Thought Professor Van Hook

LATIN—

sX1 Elementary Course Professor Demarest
sX2 Caesar, Gallic War Dr. Messer
sX3 Elementary Latin and Caesar (Direct Method) Miss Wye
sY1 Vergil, Aeneid Professor Demarest
sY2 Cicero, Selected Orations Dr. Messer
sZ Prose Composition Dr. Messer
s6 Horace, Odes and Epodes Professor Sturtevant
s9 Prose Composition Professor Ogle
s13 Vergil, Eclogues and Georgics Professor Van Hook
s39 Prose Composition—Advanced Course Professor Moore
s105 Lucretius Professor McCrea
s122 Horace, Satires and Epistles Professor Shorey
s123 Cicero, his Life, Ideals, and Permanent Influence Professor McCrea
s134 Tacitus, Histories Professor Moore
s141 Cicero's Verrine Orations (Direct Method) Miss Wye
s147 The Literary Heritage of the Middle Ages Professor Ogle

For further information address

FRANK D. FACKENTHAL, Secretary,
Columbia University, New York City

A feature of the new

COLLAR AND DANIELL'S FIRST YEAR LATIN

is the insertion of new material for reading. This includes a simplified narrative of Caesar's Campaign against the Helvetians, serving as an introduction to the second-year Latin, and several pages of Eutropius. Within the lessons themselves connected reading is given as far as possible. This greatly increases the interest of the student in the text.

(IN PREPARATION)

GINN AND

70 Fifth Avenue



COMPANY

New York

Smyth's Greek Series for Schools and Colleges

Edited under the supervision of HERBERT WEIR SMYTH, Ph.D., Eliot Professor
of Greek Literature, Harvard University

For the Study of Greek Life and Art

Wright's Short History of Greek Literature

The volume is intended first of all for students of Greek, who in their second or third year of college will profit immensely by a general survey of Greek literature. Unlike similar one-volume works in English, this book does not neglect the centuries following the death of Aristotle, but on the contrary devotes about one hundred pages to a treatment of the Alexandrian and Graeco-Roman periods.

Fowler & Wheeler's Handbook of Greek Archæology

This handbook is intended primarily for the use of students beginning the study of Greek archaeology. In the subjects of Greek sculpture and coins it has not been difficult for the English reader to get at the salient archaeological facts, but in other departments there are almost no elementary works which cover the ground adequately. The book thus meets a distinct need.

Richardson's History of Greek Sculpture

For ten years Professor Richardson was Director of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. His firsthand acquaintance with the Greek sculpture preserved in the chief museums of Europe has also given his book a quality of freshness and independence of view. The volume combines description with criticism, and is profusely illustrated with many rare photographic reproductions.

Fairbank's Handbook of Greek Religion

A simple, comprehensive study of the facts in regard to Greek religion. This handbook treats the subject under three headings: forms of worship and belief; historical sketch of Greek religion; and the relation of religion in Greece to other phases of social development.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. XI

NEW YORK, APRIL 22, 1918

No. 24

In THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 10.17 I discussed a troublesome part of Cicero, Cat. 1.5, the sentence *Si te iam, Catilina, . . . crudelius factum esse dicat*. Concerning this discussion Mr. C. R. Austin, of the South Side High School, Newark, New Jersey, has written as follows:

I feel that your first two translations are hard to grasp on account of the position of the negative and that the third is a bit bald. It seems also unfortunate that *quisquam* must be lost, as its force is so apparent and its presence so essential. . . . May I suggest that a free rendering might go somewhat as follows:

"I shall have to fear, I suppose, not that all loyal citizens will say that I have acted too late, but rather that some one will say I have acted (a little) too cruelly".

A good many, I am aware, translate this passage as Mr. Austin does. To that translation, however, there is one fatal objection, in the fact that *non* was not set by Cicero in front of the conjunction *ne*. The translation would be justified only if the Latin ran, *Non mihi verendum non ne hoc*, etc., and if, instead of *quisquam*, *aliquis* occurred in the sentence. Mr. Austin's expression "someone" is affirmative; *quisquam* belongs regularly in negative company (the negative is often implicit rather than explicit).

My first two translations are difficult to grasp because of the position of *not*. But *not* stands in the English translation exactly where *non* stands in the Latin. Cicero wrote the complicated Latin sentence; any adequate translation of it is certain to be likewise complicated. My third translation "I am sure that all loyal citizens", etc., is, as Mr. Austin says, bald. It is, in fact, not a translation at all, but a paraphrase, meant to convey to the reader a hint of the final suggestions of the passage.

Let us come back to the matter of the position of *non* in Cicero's sentence. If he had been minded to write, *non mihi verendum non ne*, etc., he might have done so without hesitation. It is no news to the readers of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY that in translation the right handling of *non* (i.e. the placing of its English equivalent) is, at times, a difficult matter. One fine illustration of this difficulty lies in the fact that good scholars have, in various Latin Grammars, laid down the doctrine that in certain Latin sentences we have examples of *ut non* instead of *ne* in final clauses, and have cited as an example Cicero, Cat. 1.23 *confer Manlium . . . ut a me non cietus ad alienos*,

sed invitatus ad tuos isse videaris. Protesting against this view, in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 2.184, 3.49, I drew a sharp distinction between such passages on the one hand as Cicero, Cat. 1.23, 27, Livy 21.5.3 in Olcadum prius fines . . . induxit exercitum *ut non petisse Saguntinos, sed rerum serie*. . . tractus ad id bellum *videri posset*, Cicero, C. M. 36 *ut reficiantur vires, non opprimantur* (we may have here, however, rather a consecutive subjunctive) and such passages on the other hand as Gellius, 19.8.12 *Sed haec ego dixi, non ut . . . fierem, sed ut ne . . . destituerem*, or Pliny Epp. 2.6.2 *Vinum . . . in tria genera discipserat, non ut potestas eligendi, sed ne ius esset recusandi*, Cicero, De Officiis 2.62, . . . *qui se adiuvari volent non ne adfligantur, sed ut altiorum gradum ascendant*. . . , 3.61 *Ita nec ut emat melius nec ut vendat quicquam, simulabit aut dissimulabit vir bonus*.

To these passages I can add now the following: Plautus, Mostellaria 389-390 *Satin habes si ego advenientem ita patrem faciam tuom, non modo ne intro eat, verum etiam ut fugiat longe ab aedibus?*; Cicero, De Officiis 2.84 *Tabulae vero novae quid habent argumenti, nisi ut emas mea pecunia fundum, eum tu habeas, ego non habeam pecuniam* <'adherent' non again>? *Quam ob rem ne sit aes alienum quod rei publicae noceat providendum est, quod multis rationibus caveri potest, non, si fuerit, ut locupletes suum perdant, debitores lucrentur alienum*. . . ('What is the meaning of an abolition of debts, except that you shall buy a farm with my money, that you shall have the farm, I shall not have (=I shall lose) the money? We must therefore take measures betimes that there shall be no debt of a sort that shall hurt the commonwealth [this menace can be guarded against by many devices], not that, if such indebtedness does occur, the rich shall lose their property, while the debtors gain what belongs really to some one else'); Pliny, Epistles 1.5.13 *Interrogavi . . . non ut tibi nocerem, sed ut Modesto*. . . ; 1.8.3 *Ideo nunc rogo ut non tantum universitati eius attendas, verum etiam particulas, qua soles lima, persequaris*; 1.8.13. . . *ita nunc in ratione edendi veremur, ne forte non aliorum utilitatibus sed propriae laudi servissae videamur*; Gellius 20.1.5 *Obscuritates . . . non adsignemus culpae scribentium, sed inscitiae non adsequentium*. . . . The last passage is particularly interesting because of the second *non*,

which is 'adherescent' with *adsequentium*. In this passage it would have been possible to write *ne* for the first *non*. A careful examination of all these passages will make plain the significance of the position of *non* in Cicero, Cat. 1.5, our starting-point, and will prove the incorrectness of the translation which Mr. Austin prefers. C. K.

A SCENE FROM ARISTOPHANES ON A GREEK VASE-PAINTING

In the *Annali* of the Istituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica in Rome, for 1847, page 216 and Plate K, is published a vase, the present location of which is unknown¹. This vase is a krater of South Italian make, with a comic scene, the interpretation of which has been the subject of many articles by learned men, who nearly all differ one from the other. I venture to propose an interpretation of the scene which has not, as far as I know, been suggested before.

Panofka, who first published the vase in the *Annali*, says that it represents Creon, an old man disguised as Antigone, and a spear-bearer²; while Heydemann maintains that it pictures Antigone arrested by two guards, in a scene of parody³.

It is obvious that the scene is thought of as comic; so why should we not try to find some extant comedy in which a scene corresponding to this occurs? It seems to me that we can find just such a scene in the *Thesmophoriazusae* of Aristophanes.

We know that the *Thesmophoriazusae* was brought out in 411 B. C., at the City Dionysia. This vase must have been made after that date, if we accept the theory that it represents a scene from this play. But this offers no real objection from the point of view of technique, as these comic vases are dated at the end of the fifth or the beginning of the fourth century.

The *Thesmophoriazusae* would lend itself to the imagination of the vase-painter because, being a non-political play, it would appeal to a far larger circle than a scene from one of the political comedies would, as the latter, outside of Attica, would probably not be understood by many people, on account of the purely local allusions.

It will be remembered that the plot of the *Thesmophoriazusae* is as follows.

Euripides, in order to defend himself against the attacks of the women at the Thesmophoria, sends his father-in-law, Mnesilochus, disguised as a woman, and dressed in clothes borrowed from the tragic poet Agathon, to plead his cause. Mnesilochus goes to the festival of the women, and in an eloquent address makes out a very good case for his son-in-law.

He is betrayed, however, by the effeminate Kleisthenes, who, because he comes as close to being a woman as any man can, is admitted, without question, to the women's mysteries. Kleisthenes announces that a man has fraudulently obtained admission to the ceremonies, and, after a scene more easily conceived than described, Mnesilochus is discovered to be the guilty person.

Mnesilochus takes advantage of the confusion to snatch from the breast of one of the women what to all outward seeming is a baby. The 'mother' then seizes the center of the orchestra, and laments in the following manner:

MICA— Hoy, hoy, there! hoy!
He's got my child, he's got my darling,
O!
He's snatched my little baby from my breast.
O, stop him, stop him! O, he's gone.
O! O!

MNESILOCHUS—Aye, weep! you ne'er shall dandle him again,
Unless you loose me. Soon shall these small limbs,
Smit with cold edge of sacrificial knife,
Incarnadine this altar!

MICA— O! O! O!
Help, women, help me! Sisters, help,
I pray.
Charge to the rescue, shout, and rout,
and scout him.
Don't see me lose my baby, my one pet!

CHORUS— Alas! Alas!
Mercy o' me! What do I see?
What can it be?
What, will deeds of shameless violence
never, never, never end?
What's the matter, what's he up to,
what's he doing now, my friend?

MNESILOCHUS—Doing what I hope will crush you out
of all your bold assurance.

CHORUS— Zounds, his words are very dreadful;
more than dreadful, past endurance.

MICA— Yes, indeed, they're very dreadful, and
he's got my baby too.

CHORUS— Impudence rare! Look at him there,
Doing such deeds, and I vow and
declare,

Never minding or caring,—
Or likely to care⁴.

All the time that these exquisite sallies and retorts are being exchanged, Mnesilochus goes on taking the large number of garments off the 'baby'. And, as he does so, he speaks as follows:

MNESILOCHUS— Now I'll undo these wrappers,
These Cretan long-clothes; and
remember, darling,
It's all your mother that has served
you thus.

¹Those who have not access to the files of the *Annali* will find the vase published in Reinach's *Répertoire des Vases Peints Grecs et Etrusques*, 1.273, note 1.

²The vase had, however, been previously published by Gerhard, *Antike Bildwerke*, Plate 73, and pp. 312 ff.

³In an article entitled *Die Phylakendarstellungen auf bemalten Vasen*, *Jahrbuch Arch. Inst.*, 1886, p. 303, no. t. Heydemann knows the Aristophanes reference; see p. 303, note 252.

⁴Throughout this paper, I use the translation of B. B. Rogers (1904 edition). This is perhaps the most remarkable translation of a play of Aristophanes ever written, as it was composed from memory, without a text.

⁵For the text see lines 688-709; for the translation see pages 160-161.

- What have we here? a flask, and not a baby!
A flask of wine, for all its Persian slippers.
O ever thirsty, ever tippling women,
O ever ready with fresh schemes for drink,
To vintners what a blessing: but to us,
And all our goods and chattels what a curse!
- MICA— Drag in the fagots, Mania; pile them up.
MNESILOCHUS—Aye, pile away; but tell me, is this baby
Really your own?
MICA— My very flesh and blood.
MNESILOCHUS—Your flesh and blood?
MICA— By Artemis it is.
MNESILOCHUS—Is it a *pint*?
MICA— Oh, what have you been doing?
Oh, you have stripped my baby of its clothes,
Poor tiny morsel!
MNESILOCHUS—*Tiny?* (Holds up a *large* bottle).
MICA— Yes, indeed.
MNESILOCHUS—What is its age? Three pitcher-feasts,
or four?
MICA— Well, thereabouts, a little over, now.
Please give it back.
MNESILOCHUS— No, thank you, not exactly.
MICA— We'll burn you then.
MNESILOCHUS— O, burn me by all means;
But anyhow I'll sacrifice this victim.
MICA— O! O! O!
Make *me* your victim, anything you like;
But spare the child.
MNESILOCHUS— A loving mother, truly,
But this dear child must needs be sacrificed.
MICA— My child! my child! give me the basin, Mania,
I'll catch my darling's blood, at any rate.
MNESILOCHUS—And so you shall; I'll not deny you that.
<Puts the bottle to his lips, and drains every drop;
taking care that none shall fall into the basin which
Mica is holding underneath>
MICA— You spiteful man! you most ungenerous man!
MNESILOCHUS—This skin, fair priestess, is your perquisite.
MICA— What is my perquisite?
MNESILOCHUS— This skin, fair priestess.
<Another woman, Critylla, now enters>
CRITYLLA— Oh, Mica, who has robbed thee of thy flower,
And snatched thy babe, thine only one,
away?
MICA— This villain here: but I'm so glad
you've come.
You see he doesn't run away, while I
Call the police, with Kleisthenes, to help us⁶.

It will be noticed that the old man in the middle of the vase-painting, whom I believe to be Mnesilochus, still holds the wine-bottle, although he is now in a later scene, in the hands of the police; and the inference

⁶For the text see lines 730-765; for the translation see pages 162-163.

is clear that he gives the bottle back to Mica after he has drunk all the wine it contained. This objection, and it seems a very serious one, can be answered by a consideration of the technique of the vase, and the deductions that we can reasonably draw therefrom.

This vase was found, according to the descriptions of Gerhard and Panofka, at Santa Agata dei Goti in Campania, the ancient Saticula, and is probably a specimen of the local technique, although it may possibly be an example of the 'School of Paestum'. Although the vase has disappeared, and there is no sure way of telling, I think it is more probable that it is Campanian, and of the local ware of Saticula. In the first place, the shape, which is that of a bell-krater, is that of the Saticula vases; in the second place, the subject is one of a kind that seemed especially to appeal to the painters of these vases⁷. Now, it is very probable that the vase-painters of this small site were not particularly learned or bookish men, and that they painted comic scenes from memory, and not from what they had read. Of course, it may be that the play was acted in Southern Italy in a corrupt form, but this does not seem to me likely; it appears to me more probable that the bottle was put in the hands of Mnesilochus on purpose, as a means of identification, as it is the outstanding feature of the scene immediately following his exposure. If I am right, therefore, it was deliberately inserted there so that the buyer might have no reason to think it either of the scenes which, in this later generation, Panofka and Heydemann have attempted to interpret it as showing⁸. For every reader of the Thesmophoriazusae will remember the baby and bottle scene, just as I did on first noticing the publication of this vase, and will say, without trying to remember that he hands back the bottle, 'Why, of course, that's Mnesilochus with the "baby"!'. Therefore, on account of this famous scene, the bottle might well be the characteristic attribute of the old man, especially to the vase-painter, who, as has been suggested above, was in all probability not a very bookish person.

Let us return to the plot of the Thesmophoriazusae. The chorus of women guards the old man, while Kleisthenes and Mica go to fetch the police. A magistrate with a policeman (called *πολιτης*) arrives, and Mnesilochus is given in charge. This moment, in my thinking, the vase-painting portrays. Mnesilochus is still in his woman's garb, and holds his female mask in his hand, while to his breast he tightly holds the 'baby' that he has snatched from the woman Mica, and which he should properly have returned to her empty before this scene began. The figure on the left is the magistrate, or *επιταξις*, while the man on the

⁷For a good, and brief, discussion of the Campanian technique, see Walters, *History of Ancient Pottery*, I.482-485; for the Saticula ware in particular, see *ibid.* 81, 484. A more complete exposition of the subject will be found in G. Patroni, *Ceramica Antica nell'Italia meridionale* (Naples, 1897), especially pages 93 ff.

⁸The reader will find in Heydemann's article a complete bibliography of this vase.

right is the *πολιτης* or policeman, who is set to guard Mnesilochus, and from whom that worthy finally escapes, in a most amusing and somewhat vulgar scene. Here again an objection offers itself. The figure of the policeman should be an archer, and this man carries no bow, but a spear instead. To this objection two answers can be made. Perhaps, by the time that this vase was painted, the word 'archer' as applied to policemen meant no more than such words as 'hussar' or 'dragoon' mean in European armies to-day, where all cavalry is armed alike, and these names are merely survivals of a time when there actually were different kinds of cavalry. Or, more probably, the vase-painter, being a South Italian, put on his vase what would be doubtless far more familiar to a South Italian buyer, a spear-carrier, as an archer was probably not so much seen there as in Athens. It seems to me credible, if not actually the case, that the men whose duty it was to keep order in the cities in Southern Italy were armed with spears. Whereas ancient representations commonly show the spear as carried by soldiers in comic scenes, the plays of Plautus and Terence nowhere mention the spear as part of the equipment of the *miles*.

I therefore would suggest that this vase-painting has been wrongly interpreted up to now, and that the true subject of the design is a scene from the *Thesmophoriazusae* of Aristophanes, showing Mnesilochus put under arrest. This interpretation gives us a vase, in addition to the few we know of already, with a scene from the great comic poet¹.

UNIVERSITY MUSEUM,
Philadelphia, Pa.

STEPHEN BLEECKER LUCE, JR.

FRENCH AUXILIARIES

The use of *avoir* as an auxiliary in the French conjugations was foreshadowed by some classical phrases, in which *habere* was used with a passive participle in agreement with a direct object. An example is Caesar, B.C. 3.89, *cohortes . . . constitutas habebat*. It is as if he were beginning to say in French, *les cohortes qu'il avait constituées*. The emphasis was a little different, perhaps, but the form was ready for modern development. In English the *have* construction of perfect tenses is practically universal, although some verbs (*come* and *gone*) permit the optional use of *be* for these tenses.

In French, however, certain verbs require the use of *être* as auxiliary. It is obvious that originally *habere* would be appropriate only with a verb having a transitive meaning and a passive participle to agree with the direct object of *habere*. But several verbs of intransitive meaning in Latin were used impersonally in the passive, as *ventum est*. When the desire for

an active auxiliary construction was felt, this impersonal form was apparently personalized into *sum ventus*, making *je suis venu*¹.

The most eccentric use of *être*, however, in the compounding of tenses is when a verb is used reflexively, even if its ordinary meaning is transitive. Thus a Frenchman might say, *j'ai coupé quelque chose* ('I have cut something'), but, if the *quelque chose* were his hand, he would likely say, *je me suis coupé* ('I me am cut'), or even, *je me suis coupé la main* ('I me am cut the hand').

In this last phrase the French *me* is apparently a dative construction, although in form like the Latin accusative, and the logical inconsistency of using a direct object with a verb *to be* suggests the query whether the French *me*, in *je me suis coupé*, may perhaps represent in this and all compound reflexive tenses an original dative of agency, in Latin. Allen and Greenough say that the dative of agency was common with passive participles in classical times, and in later writings was used with any passive.

It is well known that the Latin passive in origin contained the reflexive idea. Thus, as the passive idea submerged the reflexive, it might be perfectly natural to restore the reflexive idea, as needed in the form of the passive, by using a reflexive pronoun in the dative of agency, and, as the dative of agency was more frequent with passive participles, it would be more likely to occur and persist in the perfect periphrastic tenses of the passive. Then, as the simple passive tenses disappeared, and the forms of the dative and the accusative pronouns became confused, the compound forms of the dative reflexive passive might remain as the auxiliary tenses for a verb of which the simple active tenses were used reflexively with a direct object pronoun of the person. We may suggest the same idea in English by saying 'I am self-cut'.

Thus the French compound reflexive tenses of direct action may be considered as a survival of the compound Latin passive tenses with a dative of agency. In this construction the French participle really agrees with the subject of the verb *to be*, as in Latin or in the ordinary French passive without a reflexive (*elle est coupée*), where the form of the Latin perfect passive tenses has been shifted in meaning into the place of the simple passive tenses of Latin (*il est aimé* = Latin *amatur*, a present, rather than *amatus est*, a perfect).

When, however, we have an object in the third person in addition to the reflexive pronoun, as in *je me suis coupé la main*, the reflexive may perhaps be considered a dative of reference and the apparent object only a cognate accusative, or it may be simply a case of false analogy, as it clearly must be with certain verbs where the action of the verb is only indirectly referred back to the subject from a direct object of the idea, as in the expression *je me suis*

¹The latest list of vases with scenes from Aristophanes will be found in the *Jahreshefte* of the Austrian Archaeological Institute for 1909, 80 ff. For this reference, which was not accessible to me when I wrote this paper, and for many helpful suggestions, I am deeply indebted to Professor David M. Robinson of The Johns Hopkins University.

²No doubt the personal perfect passive with *sum* contributed to this development. See Meyer-Lübke, *Einführung in das Studium der Romanischen Sprachwissenschaft*², 191.

rappellé quelque chose, where the literal meaning is to 'call back' something to the speaker, 'to remember'. This false analogy may have originated from deponent verbs with transitive meaning, *mihi sum secutus fortunam* ('I have sought for me fortune')².

BARRISTERS HALL,
Boston, Mass.

CHARLES HERBERT SWAN.

REVIEW

Notae Latinae: an Account of Abbreviation in Latin MSS. of the Early Minuscule Period (c. 700-850).

By W. M. Lindsay. Cambridge: at the University Press; New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons (1915). Pp. xxiv + 500. \$6.00.

In 1907, a few months before his death, Traube laid the foundation for all subsequent study of Latin abbreviations in his monumental *Nomina Sacra* (Munich: Beck). In 1908, Professor Lindsay brought out his *Contractions in Early Latin Minuscule MSS* (Oxford: Parker); he has published (with the same firm) *Early Irish Minuscule Script* (1910: 12 plates) and *Early Welsh Script* (1912: 17 plates); and now this book, dedicated to Traube's memory, crowns the series—the most important discussion and tabulation of Latin abbreviations yet published. Professor Lindsay professes to confine himself to minuscule MSS of this period; we can only be grateful to him for including many interesting uncial MSS in his survey. Like all his work, this is marked by the most painstaking accuracy; every reference I have checked is exact, and the proof-reading is practically perfection.

This book claims only to be a work of reference for abbreviations; but it is much more. In its countless obiter dicta, one may learn the latest attribution of a famous MS, the newest theory of a school of scribes, or some hitherto unnoted content of a codex. The size and the convenience of the book are increased by Professor Lindsay's habit of repeating the date and provenance of a MS each time he mentions it, often with an illuminating discussion of problems which it raises. We may grant him that in such a work, with abbreviations arranged in alphabetical order, an index is not needed; but it would be a great help if, in the list of MSS at the end of the book, reference were made to these discussions. It would also save time if a catch-word were printed at the top of a page, indicating the abbreviation handled—so often does the discussion of one abbreviation cover several pages. And this discussion is no mere arrangement of data; it is an always interesting and generally convincing attempt to trace the history of the abbreviation, and its possible use as a criterion for placing and dating a MS.

Besides the material which Professor Lindsay, aided by the Carnegie Research Fund, has been gathering for several years, he has had access to Traube's unpub-

lished material. Incidentally, I must claim responsibility for a large share of the cases where he cites "according to Traube" (particularly for MSS in France and Italy), and can give chapter and verse from my notebooks.

The chief value of a review of this book must consist in the additions and the corrections which one is able to make. I shall therefore draw considerably upon my material, in the hope of contributing to the book's usefulness.

Under *aut* (p. 12, l. 6 from bottom) add Tolet. 15, 8 to the MSS using *a*. Under *autem* (p. 23, middle), note that Modena O I 11 has also *aüt*, which I found in the Chieti MS Vat. Reg. 1997. Under *carus* (p. 28), add the *ñ* cmi of the semi-uncial Verona LXI (59); the famous sacramentary Vat. Reg. 317 has *FR KR, FRS KMI, FRÄ KI, FF KMI*. The Leon palimpsest uses *KSMĒ*, and we find *krsmi* in the *Biblia Cavensis* (which is lacking from the list of MSS, though it falls within this period). I note also *FILIAE KRN* in a late inscription from Ostia (C. I. L. VI 19037). Under *celera*, add the Leon palimpsest for CTR. On pages 35-36 (which deal with *eius* represented by reversed epsilon) may be noted the ninth century fly-leaves of Paris 536, a strange mixture of Visigothic and Insular. It is perhaps worth remarking, under *de* (p. 43), that the ancient symbol (a crossed D) is still used in Spanish-speaking countries; I have seen it on street signs in Cuba! On p. 44, l. 2, add Reg. 1997 to Reg. 886. Under *est* (§ 75, second paragraph) add Escorial P I 8 and S I 17 to the MSS using *e*; on p. 69, first paragraph, and p. 73, § 76, add that *ē* (*esse*) occurs also in the ninth-century Visigothic fly-leaves of Ripoll 46 (Barcelona). On p. 69 bottom, under *+*, add 55 Sess. 2099. On p. 73, l. 10, add Paris 536. Under *filius*, add from Barb. 679 *FILz* (*filius*) and *FLz* (*fili*, f. 90). This MS has for *fratres* (p. 83) *FF, FRT, FRS*. On p. 84, l. 2, it should be noted that the Barcelona MS has also *FR MEI*; so on p. 89, l. 17, that Barb. 679 has *FRT* also for *fratrem* (f. 2). Under *pater* (§ 98) add *P* (*patri*) from the Leon palimpsest; the *p̄re* of Tolet. 35, 3 (s. IX) is common in later Visigothic. Under *gens* (p. 91), I should add that *gns* (*gentes*) is characteristically Visigothic, from the Sigüenza Latin-Arabic fragment on. Under *meus* (§ 145) add *m̄s* from a Ravenna papyrus of 557 (Van Hoesen, No. 95). To the examples under § 157, add *msrēdam* from the *Biblia Cavensis*. Under *nomen* (§ 182, a), add *nōmn* from Esc. R II 18 and T II 24. Under § 182, b, note that *nōm* (*nomine*) occurs in the Barcelona uncial. *Non* (§ 183) is more often abbreviated by *n̄* in Visigothic than is here implied; I have found it in Tolet. 99, 30; Ripoll 46; Paris 536, 609 and 4668. A variety not mentioned as Visigothic is the *n̄n* (alternating with *nō*) of the *Biblia Cavensis* (p. 145, top line).

Noster is a specially interesting article; Professor Lindsay is able to maintain that the system *nl* for

²The Italian language has a similar formation of compound reflexive tenses, and we may notice that the Italian objective pronouns, *mi, ti, si*, are apparently of dative origin, from the Latin *mihi, tibi, sibi*.

nostri, *nō* for *nostro*, dies out before 815, *nri* (also an early form) taking its place, while in Spain *nri* prevails. To § 189, add, from the uncial Verona 60, *NR*, *NRI*, *NOS*, *NIS*, *NOST*; to § 194, 3 add *DNM N* from the Barcelona uncial; this MS has *dnō nō* in a gloss. Verona 89 has also *nūt* (*nostri*). Monte Cassino 4 (a Visigothic MS perhaps later than 850) has in a gloss *nāri*, like the Leyden Corippus cited. Barb. 679 (cited p. 156, l. 5) has also *DNM NR*. In connection with § 200, next to last line, note that Verona 2 has *DNI NI* also. An early example of *n* for *numerus* is the papyrus of 443-4 (Van Hoesen, No. 78); it is not rare on inscriptions. On p. 158, l. 6, add *nmāntur* (*numeranlur*), in the Toletanus. For Visigothic abbreviations of *omnis*, the Cavensis is certainly the most bizarre—*hōms* and *hōmns*, and *hōma*; it shows *hōmptns* for *omnipotens*. Professor Lindsay has discovered that Anglo-Saxon MSS seem not to abbreviate *omnis*, while Irish MSS do; and in the Burgundian-Swiss-German area, *om* and *oms* form a rough test.

The article *per-prae-pro* would gain by compression and rearrangement, I think; it is difficult to refer to. The statement in § 224, l. 17, about the non-occurrence of *p* (*prae*) in Spain is too sweeping; but Esc. S I 17 and Ripoll 46 may well be from Catalonia, and therefore to be grouped with Montpellier 5 and Paris 536 and 609, in all five of which it is found. To the list in § 231 of early Visigothic MSS in which we find both forms for *per*, add the Cavensis. In § 240, under Visigothic, add from the Barcelona uncial, for *populum*, *PÖP*, *PÖPU*, *PÖPL*, *PÖPUL*.

Post is a particularly valuable article. On p. 195, l. 1, add the MS Tolet. 35, 3 for *p*. In § 255, under Visigothic, add *propt* from Esc. S I 17. Under § 258, last paragraph, note that Barb. 679 has also *P(RO) T(ER)*.

To the examples of confusion due to misunderstanding of *quoniam* abbreviations, add those gathered in my Text Tradition of Ammianus Marcellinus (New Haven, Ct., 1904), pp. 55-57. In connection with § 330, b I may say that I have noted *quō* in the Insular Ambros. D 268 inf., which has *qnm* also. So for § 333, I add that I found *qūm* in Verona XIII (11), f. 81 v, top; and LIII (51), f. 71. In § 334, near end, Traube's citation of Zurich Cantonalbibl. 34 is doubtless from my notes; *quōm* I found on p. 11; the MS has also *quō* and *qm*. Under § 348, one might add, for the Cavensis, *rspndit* and *rspndt*; this MS has also *sēnds* (§ 357.5).

Under *sequitur*, add *sqr* and *sqt* from Montp. 5 and later Visigothic. § 369, first line, should be qualified by the act of the Sigüenza fragment. In § 378, end, it should be noted that *st* occurs in Tol. 15, 8. At the end of § 386, I also should like to know Traube's authority; but at the end of *tempore*, I can give his reference (Leon palimpsest, p. 128 of the reprint). Under § 399, an exception should be made for Esc. R II 18, which has also the crossed *l* for *rel*. Lindsay

finds another criterion in the -ur sign: "The use of the 2-mark for 'ur' (*t* 'tur', *m* 'mur') in Continental minuscule is as sure a criterion of lateness within our period as the use of *ni*, *nō*, etc., for 'nostri', 'nostro', etc., is of earliness" (p. 376). "The 2-mark appears, as a rule, somewhere about the year 820" (p. 377). In § 479, last paragraph, note that Verona LIII (51) also shows the Visigothic s-symbol. This MS has *dnm ihm xp* (p. 402, § 6) and *dād* (*David*), § 7. To the Israel abbreviations on p. 408, add *ISR* from Verona I (1) app., and *IRHL* from Verona II (2) and the semi-uncial Vulgate palimpsest of Leon. To the varieties under *sanctus* may be added the set and seta of the Vatican papyrus of 556-569 (Van Hoesen, No. 99). *Spalis* (*spiritalis*, p. 411) is found also in Verona 20. On p. 420, note that the Toletanus 15, 8 abbreviates *vocare* by *ucr*. For *comitem* (p. 422), the Leon palimpsest has *CMT*; and for *consulibus*, it has, besides the forms given, *CÖNSSBS*, *CÖNSSLIS*, *CÖNSSB*, *CÖSSLB*, *CCLBB*, *CÖSSB* and *CÖNSS*. I should add *concilium* and *explicit* to the list of notae in this chapter. On p. 434, add *peccis* (*peccatis*) from Tolet. 35, 3. Under *perpetuus*, add that the Leon palimpsest also uses *PP* for *proposita*; it has also *PPÖ* (*praefectus praetorio*) and *PÜ* (*praefectus urbis*) (§ 104, end); I found also *PRÖCL* and *PRÖCNLSM* for *proconsulem*. *Provincia* (p. 438) is indicated by *proūc* in Verona LXI (59), semi-uncial part; it has *titl* for *titulus*.

The list of MSS at the end is most handy; if only, out of his great knowledge, Professor Lindsay had added some bibliographical notes to it! On p. 467, to MS 6224 no date is assigned; it is called 7th century on p. 154. On p. 481, it should be added that Reg. 267 came to Limoges from Fleury; a Visigothic corrector has gone through both parts of the MS, as was first noted by Liebaert. On p. 493, the MS theol. F 46 (see p. 55, bottom) is omitted.

The book closes with two lists of symbols—one showing the contrasts between Britain, Spain, Italy and the rest of the Continent, the other those differing in Irish and Anglo-Saxon.

In closing, let me say that the book is an indispensable handbook for all students of medieval history and literature as well as of paleography; and that it is a work of the first rank in every respect.

AMERICAN ACADEMY IN
ROME.

CHARLES UPSON CLARK.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND THIRTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING

The Thirteenth Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of New England was held at Loomis Institute, Windsor, Conn., on March 22-23. Loomis Institute is beautifully situated on a small plateau, about six miles from Hartford, not far from the junction of the Farmington and Connecticut Rivers. The perfect weather, and the charming hospitality of the Institute helped to make the meeting a memorable one.

The programme was as follows: Welcome, by Mr. Nathaniel Horton Batchelder, Head Master of Loomis Institute, with response by Dr. J. E. Barss, President of the Association; In Memoriam, John Williams White, Professor William Fenwick Harris, Cambridge; The Present and Future of Greek in New England Secondary Schools, Professor H. D. Brackett, Clark College; Some Observations on Comparative Standards of Latin and Non-Latin Students in the Secondary School, Mr. G. M. Rodwell, Loomis Institute; Pilate's Wife, Professor R. W. Husband, Dartmouth College; Some References to Literature in Plautus and Terence, Professor Charles Knapp; Archaeological Record, Professor Caroline M. Galt, Mt. Holyoke College; The Form of the Epistle in Horace, Professor E. P. Morris, Yale University; Scenes from Aristophanes' Birds in Modern Parlance, Professor W. S. Burrage, Middlebury College; Two Schoolmasters of the Renaissance <the paper dealt with Cordier and Vives>, Professor Florence Alden Gragg, Smith College; The Value of the Traditions respecting the Early Kings of Rome, Professor William Ridgeway, Cambridge University, England; Casualties in Latin Examinations and Official Responsibility, Dr. James J. Robinson, Hotchkiss School; Notes on the Results of the College Entrance Examinations in Latin, Professor Nelson Glenn McCrea, Columbia University; Report of the Committee on Questionnaire, by Mr. Albert S. Perkins, Dorchester High School, Miss Adele Allen, Holyoke High School, and Dr. Josiah Bridge,

Westminster School, Simsbury, Conn. This questionnaire was one issued originally by The Classical Association of the Middle West and South. It dealt with the possibility of supervision of the work of young teachers in the Schools, of organized efforts to give practical assistance, by correspondence or visits, to such teachers, and with the teaching of Greek and the furnishing of opportunities for the study of that language in the Schools. A report on this Questionnaire is to be presented, I think, at the meeting, this spring, of The Classical Association of the Middle West and South.

There is not space to discuss the papers here. The Classical Association of New England publishes annually a Bulletin, giving information concerning the Society, and presenting brief abstracts of the papers. Copies of this can be obtained from the Secretary of the Association.

The meeting was a decided success, in attendance, in opportunities given and accepted to meet one's fellow-workers, and in the interest and suggestiveness of the papers.

Professor George E. Howes, who had been Secretary-Treasurer of the Association from its foundation, found himself unable longer to serve in that capacity; he is at present in Washington, on the staff of Dr. Garfield. Professor Howes was elected President for the new year, and Professor M. N. Wetmore, of Williams College, was elected Secretary-Treasurer.

C. K.

THE STAR-SPANGLED BANNER

Oh! say can you see, by the dawn's early light,
What so proudly we hailed at the twilight's last gleam-
ing?

Whose broad stripes and bright stars through the
perilous fight

O'er the ramparts we watched were so gallantly
streaming?

And the rocket's red glare, the bomb bursting in air,
Gave proof through the night that our flag was still
there:

O say does that star-spangled banner yet wave

O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave?

On the shore dimly seen through the mists of the deep,
Where the foe's haughty host in dread silence reposes,
What is that which the breeze, o'er the towering steep,
As it fitfully blows, half conceals, half discloses?

Now it catches the gleam of the morning's first beam,
In full glory reflected now shines in the stream:

'Tis the star-spangled banner—O long may it wave

O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave!

O thus be it ever when freemen shall stand
Between their loved home and the war's desolation!
Blest with victory and peace may the heav'n rescued
land

Praise the power that hath made and preserved us a
nation!

Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just.

And this be our motto—"In God is our Trust".

And the star-spangled banner in triumph shall wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave!

FRANCIS SCOTT KEY.

VEXILLUM STELLATUM¹

Potestne cerni, profulgente die,
salutaturn signum circa noctis adventum?

Lati clavi et stellae, decertante acie,
glorioso cingunt oppidi munimentum!—

Iaculumque rubens, globis sursum rumpens
per noctem monstrant vexillum fulgens.

stellatumne vexillum volans tegit nos,

patriam liberam fortiumque domos?

Vix in ora maris visum per tenebras,
hostis ubi castra tacitus collocavit,
quid est hoc quod ventus, montis per latebras
volitans, aperit rursus et complicavit?

Cum sol eminent, dulce signum ridet,
maris mox in puro speculo se videt.

stellatum vexillum diu protegat nos,

patriam liberam fortiumque domos!

Sic esto semper, manus si libera
arceat a patria belliavastationem!
Triumphante pace patria prospera

Deum laudet qui nos statuit nationem!

Victoria mea est, quando causa iusta est;
haec nostra sit vox: "Deus salus nostra est".

Stellatum vexillum triumphans teget nos,
patriam liberam fortiumque domos!²

ST. STANISLAUS SEMINARY,
Florissant, Mo.

A. F. GEYSER, S. J.

¹An accentual translation, retaining the meter, rhythm, and rhyme of the English ode. The Latin version can be sung to the popular melody.

²Application for copyright of this translation is pending.

REJOINDER OF MESSRS. CLARK AND GAME

The review of our First Latin, in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 11.118-120, pleases us by its praise of several of the features on which we pride ourselves, but it fails to mention what will be especially to inexperienced teachers its chief advantage—the division into lessons which fit into the ordinary school year. It will not be necessary to resort to the Procrustean method which teachers have to adopt with most beginners' books. The text is planned out with "a lesson a day for a year." This is the first point we make in our Introduction and we feel that it should appear in any review of the book.

We do not wish to appear captious in objecting to certain of the criticisms, but surely a beginner in the study of Latin should not be required to stress artificial word order (which in Cicero is based mainly on rhetorical and rhythmical considerations), when one realizes that perhaps only ten per cent of these beginners will ever go on into advanced work, and not two per cent will ever write Latin prose of any pretension to style. There are so many things which must be done during the first year that good common sense must incline us towards stressing only those things which are necessarily urgent. In easy Latin conversation, Petronius and Plautus seemed to us safer models than Cicero or Caesar.

Furthermore, it is dangerous to object to a sentence as not good Latin; the sentence *liber tibi mittetur*, which the reviewer condemns, is Cicero's own expression (Ad Att. 1.13.5).

We have been through the entire corpus of Cicero's letters and philosophical works in our search for unhackneyed material for exercises and illustrations, and we would have appreciated recognition of this labor of many weeks.

Several of the suggestions and corrections are excellent. We are grateful for them, and shall utilize them gladly. We are quite sure, however, that a review by some High School teacher who is doing this kind of teaching would have been more helpful to your readers. This book came out of actual teaching experience, and it is now being used in a number of Schools. The reports which are coming to us establish our claim that the new features do really arouse a keener interest in the subject, and bring other gratifying results. The interest of the pupils is the chief sheet-anchor in the storms which are beating upon the Classics. We have done our best to furnish a text that will make friends for Latin study, and we believe that we have succeeded in doing so. We ask to be judged not so much by our use of "shall" and "will" (though we are still unconvinced by any heresy in that matter), or by any similar subjective criticisms, but by the actual results of the book as taught in class. We wish that your reviewer had applied that test to it.

CHARLES UPSON CLARK,
JOSIAH BETHEA GAME.

PROFESSOR HODGMAN'S REPLY

I cheerfully concede that many beginners' books give too long lessons; First Latin certainly avoids this mistake.

It is difficult enough to teach one type of Latin; therefore, I believe we should teach the one, best type. I regret the authors' expression, "artificial word order," for what we find in the best Latin. They speak of Petronius and Plautus as safer models than Cicero or Caesar; well, then, for the position of possessives, take Petronius, Cena 62—nine instances such as *servus noster*, and not one of the reverse order. Plautus, Menaechmi 281-282 has *parasitum tuum*, followed immediately by *meum parasitum* (emphatic surprise).

Latin commonly brings out the idea of limit of motion, rather than that of personal concern; for this reason I

object to *liber tibi mittetur* as a model sentence for a beginners' book. It is from Cicero, to be sure, but from the correspondence (Ad Att. 1.13.5). "In the letters to Atticus, and other familiar acquaintances, Cicero writes very freely; those addressed to more distant acquaintances are generally cautious and careful in style" (Teuffel-Warr, §187.1). Cicero himself touches on this matter (Ad Fam. 9.21.1). If we are to follow plebeian Latin, we must allow children to use *alterae* as a dative whenever they want to, *persuadeo* and *fungor* with an accusative.

Often before have College teachers been reproved for not understanding the conditions of Secondary work. It so happens that in addition to my College work, I have during the past eleven years regularly taught, one period a day, School classes of the usual High School age. This experience has kept me in closer touch with the problems of Secondary Schools than a College teacher is sometimes supposed to be.

I am glad to learn that the book, within five months after publication, is meeting with success. I praised what seemed to me commendable, and felt equally at liberty to call attention to infelicities. Some criticism is inevitably subjective; when, however, the authors say that my comment on their use of 'shall' and 'will' is subjective criticism, I most emphatically protest. Such sentences as, "Would you like to make a trip?", "Where will you be tomorrow? We shall be in the villa", "We would have appreciated", and "shall, will, will, shall, shall, shall" in a paradigm, are simply not good English; if it be heresy to maintain that they are not good, I am content to remain an unblushing heretic. If Latin teachers do not guard their own English, the common argument for the value of Latin as an aid to good English ceases to be cogent.

The authors' rejoinder fails to convince me that I should retract anything I said about the infelicities of the book; I am glad to reiterate all that I said about its positive merits.

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY. ARTHUR WINFRED HODGMAN.

THE NEW YORK CLASSICAL CLUB

The spring meeting of the Forum of The New York Classical Club, which was held in the auditorium of Hunter College on Saturday morning, March 16, was devoted to The Study of Latin as a Foundation for French and Spanish. There was a considerable attendance of teachers of both modern and classical languages. Several messages were read by Mr. Hodges, Chairman of the Forum Committee of the Club, among them a letter in which Dr. William R. Price, Specialist in Modern Languages for The New York State Department of Education, he strongly endorsed the proposition that the study of Latin should precede that of the Romance languages. The speakers were Professor Adolph Cohn, former Head of the Department of Romance Languages in Columbia University, Dr. Lawrence A. Wilkins, Director of Modern Languages in the High Schools of New York City, and Dr. William T. Vlymen, Principal of the Eastern District High School. Professor Cohn and Dr. Vlymen both effectively presented the case for Latin as the language with which, after the vernacular, students should begin their linguistic education. Dr. Wilkins, who had frankly stated his position when asked to be one of the speakers, took what may be called the negative side of the discussion; he spoke especially for the claims of Spanish at the present time, but his preference was for beginning either of the Romance languages before taking up Latin. Not only were the announced addresses interesting, but a brisk discussion was started, in which several took part on both sides, and the Direct Method was not left unmentioned.

A. P. BALL, *Censor*.